| 1 | |
|----------------------|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 6 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA |
| 7 | * * * |
| 8 | NICHOLAS OLIVA; JOAN OLIVA, individuals,) 2:08-CV-01559- PMP-LRL |
| 10 | Plaintiffs, ORDER |
| 11 | vs.) |
| 12 13 14 15 | NATIONAL CITY CORPORATION; NATIONAL CITY MORTGAGE COMPANY; NATIONAL CITY BANK OF INDIANA; MICHAEL DEMING, individually and as an employee/agent of National City; VIVIAN FURLOW, individually and as an employee/agent of National City, |
| 17 | Defendants. |
| 18 | |
| 19 | On July 2, 2010, the following motions came on for hearing before the |
| 20 | Court: |
| 21 | Defendants' Motion in Limine (Doc. #43); Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Comply |
| 22 | with FRCP 26(a) (Doc. #44); 3. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. |
| 23 | #45); and4. Plaintiffs' Request for Review of Magistrate's Order |
| 24 | Granting Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Expert, Ian Hirsch, and Denying Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel |
| 25 | Discovery Responses and to Reopen Discovery (Doc. #62) |
| 26 | |

Having considered the arguments of counsel presented, the Court hereby finds as follows:

The Order of Magistrate Judge Leavitt (Doc. #60) granting Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Expert Ian Hirsch, and denying Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery Responses and to Reopen Discovery (Doc. #62) is not, under the circumstances presented before the Magistrate Judge, clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Request for Review of Magistrate's Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Expert, Ian Hirsch, and Denying Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery Responses and to Reopen Discovery (Doc. #62) is **DENIED**, and the Order (Doc. #60) entered by Magistrate Judge Leavitt is hereby affirmed.

As to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Comply with FRCP 26(a) (Doc. #44), the Court finds that although Plaintiffs have failed to fully comply with the Rule's requirements, dismissal of Plaintiffs' Complaint is not warranted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Comply with FRCP 26(a) (Doc. #44) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' shall, not later than <u>August</u> <u>6, 2010</u>, produce for Defendants all documents upon which Plaintiffs rely upon to support their claims for damages.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that with respect to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #45), the Court finds it appropriate to grant Plaintiffs limited relief in the form of 60 additional days for purposes of conducting discovery pursuant to Rule 56(f). Specifically, the Court finds it appropriate to require that Defendants produce for inspection and copying by Plaintiffs documents in Defendants' possession reflecting the published interest rates for the relevant time

| 1 | period for both seven-year and three-year adjustable rate mortgages, as previously |
|----|---|
| 2 | requested by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs and Defendants thereafter shall conduct any |
| 3 | additional depositions necessary to complete discovery on the issue of whether |
| 4 | between May 2005 and May 2008, Plaintiffs paid monthly interest rates consistent |
| 5 | with a seven-year adjustable rate mortgage rather than a three-year adjustable rate |
| 6 | mortgage. Such discovery shall be completed within 60 days from the date of this |
| 7 | Order. |
| 8 | IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary |
| 9 | Judgment (Doc. #45) is DENIED without prejudice to renew the same following |
| 10 | completion of the above referenced discovery permitted in accord with Rule 56(f). |
| 11 | IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion in Limine (Doc. |
| 12 | #43) is DENIED without prejudice to renew the same at least 45 days prior to the |
| 13 | commencement of trial in this case. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | DATED: July 7, 2010. |
| 16 | Phip m. On |
| 17 | PHILIP M PRO |
| 18 | United States District Judge |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |